



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 22, 2015

No. 115

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TIPTON).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 22, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable SCOTT R. TIPTON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

IRAN AGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, it was interesting to listen to some of the congressional reactions after the United Nations Security Council on Monday unanimously approved a resolution that creates a basis for international economic sanctions against Iran to be lifted.

This was a 15-0 vote for the 104-page resolution that lays out the steps required for lifting the United Nations

sanctions. Importantly, it sets up a way to renew sanctions if Iran does not abide by its commitments.

If we get into a dispute over Iran's enrichment activities, these sanctions automatically snap back after 30 days; and the United States, as a member of the Security Council, could veto any effort to change that. The United States controls the snap back.

Congress should not be annoyed but, instead, should understand and appreciate the unanimous support from the major countries that helped secure the agreement and enforce sanctions in the first place.

The United States did not bring Iran to the negotiating table by itself. We have been sanctioning Iran for years with far more stringent and stronger economic body blows, but they didn't bite until we were joined by other powerful countries.

It required Japan and India not to buy Iranian oil and the unanimous support of the U.N. Security Council, plus Germany, the so-called P5+1, to hammer this out.

This is vital information for Congress to evaluate. Were we to walk away from this historic international agreement that has the participation of all the other major powers and the consumers of Iranian oil, we would be on our own.

If we repudiate this hard-fought, carefully crafted diplomatic solution, we will be in an infinitely weaker position, Iran free to go about its business, and the support of those other countries that was so vital will melt away.

There is a reason why 100 distinguished former administration officials, diplomats, and military officials from all across the political spectrum with backgrounds in Democratic and Republican administrations alike endorsed the proposal this week.

This is the best solution in a difficult part of the world with a country that has been difficult to work with, to say

the least, that has been involved with bad behavior and which has been bent on developing the capacity to create a nuclear weapon. We all want to prevent that or at least delay it as long as possible.

This agreement achieves that additional time, 10 years or more. It has strong, enforceable sanctions in the event of failure; and the inspections regime, the controls over the Iranian nuclear power program continue for 10 years or more. Some are permanent.

This is a watershed moment in American diplomacy, an opportunity to get past the troubled history for decades on a more positive footing. Iran, to this point, has lived up to its agreements; and we have watched their nuclear activity being dialed back and openness expanded, which would have been unthinkable 3 years ago.

Last and most important to consider, the opponents of this agreement have no good alternative. They may huff and puff about all options being on the table; but realistically, the American public has little appetite for a war with Iran, a country bigger than Afghanistan and Iraq combined, with a population more than twice as large, well-educated and sophisticated.

An attack would bring about unthinkable circumstances, even if the American public were likely to accept it, which is highly unlikely; and, of course, the United States will have squandered the alliance with the world's most powerful countries. They are aligned with us today, but it would be difficult, if not impossible, to get them back on our side again if we can't take yes for an answer.

Congress should stop hyperventilating, look at the evidence, and we should move forward to support diplomacy as our best chance to prevent a nuclear-armed Iran and chaos in the Middle East.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H5335